

Interview Summary	Application No. 09/920,439	Applicant(s) KNOCHE ET AL.	
	Examiner Marie Patterson	Art Unit 3728	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Marie Patterson.

(3) Andrew Jagenow.

(2) Christopher Stamos.

(4) Sarah Talbot.

Date of Interview: 30 March 2004.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☒ Yes e) ☐ No.

If Yes, brief description: A lightweight shoe with a sole having the embedded mesh.

Claim(s) discussed: proposed amended claims.

Identification of prior art discussed: applied references.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant proposes to amend the claims to define the mesh being a continuously exposed layer which is not interrupted in the exposure of the mesh. Exact language will be considered upon formal filing.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required